



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,549	11/28/2001	Ernie F. Brickell	10559-505001/P8790X	7968

20985 7590 02/17/2004
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,549

Applicant(s)

BRICKELL ET AL.

Examiner

Pierre E. Elisca

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/03/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16,18-23,25-34 and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed on 12/03/2002.
2. Claims 2, 17, 24 and 35 are canceled, Claims 1, 3-16, 18-23, 25-34 and 36-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 (b)

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-16, 18-23, 25-34, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Gasser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,224,163).

As per claims 1, 3-16, 20-23, 25-34, and 38-40 Gasser discloses a method/system for delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system to another for a computing session, wherein a session public/private encryption key pair is utilized for each computing session (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that receiving from a delegator), comprising:
receiving, from a delegator, a designation of a role and a delegate to assume the role (see., abstract, col 3, lines 7-48);

receiving, from a credential service provider, an indication that the designation is valid (see., abstract, col 3, lines 26-48, specifically wherein it is stated that if the user's name if found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted, col 6, lines 33-66); and

issuing a delegation credential in response to receiving the indication (see., col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that if the user's name if found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted). The limitation wherein said send a message to the delegator indicating that the delegation credential has been assigned, and Applicant's newly added limitation wherein said the delegation credential includes encoded delegation information is also disclosed by Gasser in the abstract, col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system. A private key (or encoded delegation) enables each entity to identify itself to other entities and to encode certain message. When a user requests access to a system resource, the user's name is compared to the resource's access control list. If the user's name if found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted (granted or credential has been assigned).

As per claims 18, and 36, Gasser discloses the claimed method of storing the delegation credential in a database maintained by a delegation service provider (see., col 3, lines 7-15, specifically wherein it is stated that public key are stored with the entities names in a global naming service).

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 19, and 37, Gasser discloses the claimed method wherein identifying comprises checking a hash of the confirmation code to identify the delegator (see., col 5, lines 10-67, specifically wherein it is stated that RSA cryptography or has function).

REMARKS

5. In response to Applicant's arguments, Applicant argues that the prior art of record (Gasser) taken alone or in combination fails to show:

a. " how issuing a delegation credential is equivalent to granting access to a resource". Examiner respectfully disagrees since Gasser discloses a delegating authorization from one entity in a distributing system. Each entity on the distributed is given a unique name and a private key/public key for encoding and decoding certain messages, and therefore, delegation credential is readable as access rights or granting access to a certain messages. Applicant should duly note that the delegation authorization of Gasser is based on a unique name and also on a private key/public key, accordingly, delegation credential is equivalent to granting access to a resource or message.

b. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Gasser does not mention "outstanding delegation requests much less a request for outstanding requests". As stated in the Office action mailed on 05/05/2003, Gasser discloses when a user makes a request of a resource or message, the reference monitor (i.e., the manager of access to the resource) looks for the requesting user on that resources access control list. If the user's name id found (or membership in a group is verified), the requested access is

Art Unit: 3621

granted. Please note that the requesting user on that resource access control list or membership ID in a group is readable as outstanding delegation requests. Therefore, Applicant arguments are moot.

c. "Applicant argues that Gasser system is silent about encoding any information when the remote resource grants access to a user". Based upon the foregoing rejection indicated above, it is believed that Gasser discloses this limitation in the abstract, col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system. A private key (or encoded delegation) enables each entity to identify itself to other entities and to encode certain message. When a user requests access to a system resource, the user's name is compared to the resource's access control list. If the user's name is found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted (granted or credential has been assigned).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/03/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3621


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 703 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703 305-9769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3621

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pierre E. Elisca".

Pierre Eddy Elisca

Primary Patent Examiner

February 10, 2004